

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 6, 2007. Claims 1-24 and 38 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 13 and 24 are in independent form. Claims 1, 13 and 24 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 11 and 38 have been amended as to matters of form; no change in scope is either intended or believed effected by at least these latter changes. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032218 A1 (Huang); and Claims 2, 4, 8, 10-12, 14, 16, 19, 21-23 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,317 B1 (Sasaki et al.).

On January 2, 2008, Applicant's undersigned attorney conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner to discuss Applicant's arguments regarding the patentability of the claimed invention over the cited prior art. The arguments made during the interview are set forth in detail below. During the interview, the Examiner suggested that the display means/step be amended to insert the phrase "a group consisting of" before --(i) a smallest size....-. Applicant has incorporated this suggestion into the claim amendments, as shown above. This constitutes the statement of substance of the interview.

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 13 and 24 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a printing apparatus including: (1) storage means for storing document data received via a network and described in a predetermined structured description language; (2) analysis means for analyzing the document data stored by the storage means and recognizing font sizes contained in the document data, and for recognizing characters contained in the document data to which the font sizes are applied; (3) display means for displaying a first font size to be selected from among a group consisting of (i) a smallest size, (ii) a most frequently used size and (iii) all sizes on an operation panel of the printing apparatus; (4) instruction input means for selecting the first font size from among the smallest size, the most frequently used size and the all sizes displayed on the operation panel by the display means, and entering a second font size to be used for formatting the document data for printing on at least one print page, the second font size being different from the first font size; (5) discrimination means for discriminating whether the first font size selected by the instruction input means indicates the smallest size, the most frequently used size or the all sizes; (6) scaling means for scaling all the characters contained in the document data (a) such that a smallest font size in the document data becomes equal to the second font size entered by the instruction input means, if the discrimination means discriminates that the first font size indicates the smallest size, (b) such that a most frequently used font size in the document data becomes equal to the entered second font size, if the discrimination means discriminates that the first font size indicates the most frequently used size, and (c) such that all font sizes in the document become equal to the entered second font size, if the discrimination means discriminates that the first font size indicates the all sizes; (7) image forming means for executing an image forming process such that data representing the character recognized by the analysis means is outputted for printing on the at

least one print page on which contents of the document data are laid out in accordance with the scaling by the scaling means; and (8) printing means for printing data based on print data formed in the image forming process executed by the image forming means. The document data does not include a concept of page.

Printers perform printing page by page. Logical pages formed by applications may not have expected print results in some cases, e.g., in N-up printing. For example, even when a 14-point size is assigned to such logical pages by an application, printed data may have a 7-point size if 2-up printing is designated. The present invention solves this problem by allowing the printing apparatus to set a desired font size in order to ensure printing with that font size without any influence due to an application setting or N-up printing. If a 24-point size, for example, is set in the printing apparatus, printed data will definitely have the 24-point size, irrespective of any print layout setting or enlarge/reduction image setting by applications or printer drivers.

In contrast, Huang is understood to merely relate to a computer for producing structured documents with user-defined document type definitions and having a document conversion process for converting an unstructured document into a metafile and modifying the metafile in accordance with received document type definitions (see, paragraphs [0003], [0011], and [0013]). In Huang, font sizes may be changed to a desired font size within the personal computer, but does not teach or suggest setting on the printing apparatus side. In Huang, for example, an original font size of 32 point may be changed to a designated size of 24 point within the computer. Even when the 24-point size is designated in the computer, however, if the document is printed, the printed data will have a 12-point size if 2-up is designated by the printer

driver. Thus, Applicant has found nothing in Huang that would teach or suggest at least a “printing apparatus comprising... display means for displaying a first font size to be selected from among a group consisting of (i) a smallest size, (ii) a most frequently used size and (iii) all sizes on an operation panel of said printing apparatus,” “instruction input means for selecting the first font size from among the smallest size, the most frequently used size and the all sizes displayed on the operation panel by said display means, and entering a second font size to be used for formatting the document data for printing on at least one print page, the second font size being different from the first font size,” “discrimination means for discriminating whether the first font size selected by said instruction input means indicates the smallest size, the most frequently used size or the all sizes,” “scaling means for scaling all the characters contained in the document data (a) such that a smallest font size in the document data becomes equal to the second font size entered by said instruction input means, if said discrimination means discriminates that the first font size indicates the smallest size, (b) such that a most frequently used font size in the document data becomes equal to the entered second font size, if said discrimination means discriminates that the first font size indicates the most frequently used size, and (c) such that all font sizes in the document become equal to the entered second font size, if said discrimination means discriminates that the first font size indicates the all sizes,” “image forming means for executing an image forming process such that data representing the character recognized by said analysis means is outputted for printing on the at least one print page on which contents of the document data are laid out in accordance with the scaling by said scaling means” or “printing means for printing data based on print data formed in the image forming process executed by said image forming means,” as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action cites paragraphs [0047] - [0048] as disclosing the printer apparatus of Claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Those paragraphs merely discuss, among other things, Figures 3A, which illustrates a conversion module 302 comprising an association engine 304 and an integration module 306, and Figure 3B which depicts an environment 320 implementing conversion module 302. Paragraph [0048] discusses that a metafile version of a document uploaded for display contains displayable objects, each object being “defined by a number of attributes or decoration information including, but not limited to, type, size, color and position of the object such that it can be ‘printed’ correctly.” However, Figures 3A and 3B clearly depict parts of a computer, not a printing apparatus, as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action further states (page 19) that “Applicant argues nothing in Huang teaches or suggests the limitations drawn to the instruction input means where a first font size is selected among a smallest size, a most frequently used size, and all sizes, the discrimination means and the scaling means” and further states that the Examiner “disagrees as the claim as currently recited claims ‘if’ clauses, which “are conditional and do not require all the cases to occur.” Applicant strongly disagrees. There are absolutely no “ifs” in the display means, instruction means and discrimination means recitations of Claim 1 and those recitations require displaying, selecting from among and discriminating between, respectively, three types of font sizes: (i) a smallest size, (ii) a most frequently used size and (iii) all sizes, such that the user may freely select any one of them as the first font size. The disclosure of one of the three is not sufficient. In contrast, Huang at best selects all the sizes only.

Moreover, the Office Action fails to indicate where in Huang the

discrimination means is disclosed at all. If another Office Action is deemed necessary, Applicant respectfully requests that it clearly indicate where in Huang this feature of Claim 1 is found.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Huang.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claims 13 and 24 are method and computer memory medium claims, respectively corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/

Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1794532v1